

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 09/855,535 05/16/2001 Karel van den Berg 8553/215 10/25/2006 **EXAMINER** Penrose Lucas Albright, Esq. GRILES, BETHANY L MASON, MASON & ALBRIGHT P.O. BOX 2246 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER Arlington, VA 22202-0246 3643

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/855,535	BERG ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bethany L. Griles	3643	
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address	
Period for Reply			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REI WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by sta Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the may earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNION 1.1.136(a). In no event, however, may a residual apply and will expire SIX (6) MON tutte, cause the application to become AB	CATION.  eply be timely filed  THS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	2 November 2005.		-
2a) This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) T	his action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow	wance except for formal matt	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice unde	er <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 80-110 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) □ Claim(s) is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ⊠ Claim(s) 80-110 are subject to restriction are	drawn from consideration.		. ·
Application Papers			•
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ a	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•	
Applicant may not request that any objection to			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume  2. Certified copies of the priority docume  3. Copies of the certified copies of the papplication from the International Bur  * See the attached detailed Office action for a	ents have been received. ents have been received in A priority documents have been reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	,	Numman (PTO 442)	
<ol> <li>Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> </ol>	Paper No(	Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of I 6) Other:	nformal Patent Application —·	

Art Unit: 3643

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species are as follows:

Species 1: Figure 1

Species 2: Figure 2

Species 3: Figure 3

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 3643

The claims are deemed to correspond to the species listed above in the following manner:

Species 1:

Subspecies 1a: Claim 82 Subspecies 1b: Claim 83 Subspecies 1c: Claim 84

Species 2:

Subspecies 2a: Claims 86 and 88 Subspecies 2b: Claims 87 and 89

Species 3: Claim 107

The following claim(s) are generic: 80, 81, 85, 90-110

The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: There are different categories of invention permitted by 1.475(b). The immediate application discloses 3 different apparatus, which is not a category specified by 1.475(b). Further, and in reference to Lely (US5,983,833), Examiner contends that there is no special technical feature that provides a contribution over the prior art, as required by 1.475(a).

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

Art Unit: 3643

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bethany L. Griles whose telephone number is 571.272.6888. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday 5.30am-11.30am and Thursday 5.30am to 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 571.272.6891. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3643

nles

blg

Bethany L. Griles Examiner

Art Unit 3643

Peter M. Poon Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 3600

10/24/06